Conference on Effectively Restoring Ecosystems
22-24 August 2000, St. Louis, Missouri

BACKGROUND

Session: Breakout 3C
Topic: Case Studies – Miscellaneous
Moderator: Hugh McClellan, CESAM
Recorder: Jennifer Parris, CESAM
Panelists:

- Brian Peck, CESAM
- George Hart, CENWS
- Tim George, CEVMS

Objective: To identify characteristics of successful ecosystem restoration efforts and to provide lessons learned.
Description: The following case studies were presented:
Case studies to be presented include:

- Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Wildlife Mitigation
- Howard Hanson Dam
- East St. Louis Environmental Restoration and Flood Control

Following the presentations was a open discussion of criteria that could be used to set funding priorities for Environmental Restoration Projects.

HIGHLIGHTS

Ideas generated from presentations:

- **Endangered and Threatened Species Benefits**. Promote endangered and threatened species benefits from USACE projects.
- **Partnerships**. Develop partnerships with other federal, state, and local agencies to develop a working relationship that enables one to increase the effectiveness of completing a project.
- **Local Sponsors Lobbying for Funding**. Local sponsors should communicate among themselves to exchange the knowledge of how to obtain funding for various projects.
- **Ecosystem Units – Needs**. Develop means to measure ecosystem benefits from restoration projects. In this development, take into consideration that various areas in the country provide different percentages of benefits.
- **Impacts on the Quality of Human Life**. Emphasize benefits to the quality of human life that a USACE project will have on the community.

A few minutes at the end of the session was used to brainstorm criteria that could be used to set funding priorities for ecosystem restoration projects. The following criteria were suggested:

- Scarcity
- Wetlands
- Recreation

- Endangered and threatened species
- Water quality
- Severely degraded habitat
- Restoration location